

## **REMARKS**

**Claims in the Application.** Claims 7, 13-16, 20, 21, 25-36, 39, 45 and 46 have been cancelled from this application. Accordingly, Claims 1-6, 8-12, 17-19, 22-24, 37, 38, 40-44 and 47 are active in this application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**Examiner's Rejection Over *Noergaard*.** The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-6, 8-12, 19, 22-24, 37, 38, 40-44, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,981,024 ("*Noergaard*"). This ground for rejection is traversed.

*Noergaard* is referenced in the bridging paragraph of pages 7 and 8 of Applicant's originally filed specification. *Noergaard* does not show laminations being applied to at least one of the separating surfaces. Therefore, independent claims 1, 40 and 42 are not anticipated by *Noergaard*.

The Examiner references col. 19, ll. 15-21 of *Noergaard*. This passage is drawn to the embodiment of *Noergaard* which shows that the technique of applying a top and bottom layer of the folded and compacted mineral fibre web may be modified by deleting one of the layers such as the top layer or alternatively the bottom layer constituted by the web 108 and 110, respectively or by applying e.g. a foil or foils to one or both sides of the folded and compacted mineral fibre web 70.

Fig. 8 of *Noergaard* shows a product which is the result of a method with the last step shown in Fig. 5. Fig. 5 shows a folded and compacted mineral fibre web produced as described with reference to Fig. 1. This mineral fibre web is brought into contact with mineral fibre webs 108 and 110 which are produced as described with reference to Fig. 4a. These mineral fibre webs have a fibre orientation parallel to their large surfaces.

Even if Fig. 5 and Fig. 8 of *Noergaard* shows the technique of applying a top and bottom layer to the folded and compacted mineral fibre web, these Figures only show the technique of applying a top and bottom layer made of a fibre web on the surfaces of the mineral fibre web having a fibre orientation parallel to their large surfaces.

One of skill in the art would recognize that a fibre orientation parallel to large surfaces has the advantage of very good heat insulation properties but weak compressive strength. To attain high compressive strength, *Noergaard* proposes the use of layers of

mineral fibres having a high bulk density to increase the compressive strength of the mineral fibre boards.

Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art reading *Noergaard* does not get a hint to use a lamination on at least of the separating surfaces of the two webs of insulating material as *Noergaard* only discloses laminations as elements to increase the compressive strength of the product. Such laminations are not necessary on the separating surfaces because the fibre orientation in these areas is already perpendicular to the large surfaces so that an element increasing the compressive strength is not needed. There would be no motivation of one skilled in the art to use such laminations on the separating surfaces.

Further, *Noergaard* does not teach a solution for improving a generic method for the production of a web of insulating material made of mineral fibres such that the web of insulating material produced would exhibit or more easily exhibit characteristics such as stability and processability, particularly in the field of external buildings surfaces and covering surfaces of pipelines. There is a difference between increasing the compressive strength of such a product and increasing stability and processability of such a product.

Fig. 5 and Fig. 8 of *Noergaard* relate to adding mineral fibre webs (108 and 110) to the folded web (70) before the curing oven (141), and are hence not related to the same step in the process. Thus, the combination of Fig. 7 with Fig. 5 or Fig. 8 of *Noergaard* does not lead to the invention as claimed by Applicant; specifically the webs (108 and 110) in *Noergaard* are not arranged on the separating surfaces, and a combination would lead to a web (150) leaving the curing oven (141) with a web (108 and 110) on the top and/or bottom surface, and then (for example) a further foil (209) adhered to the top of the web (108). Nothing, however, on the separating surfaces.

In Applicant's invention, the lamination is not applied to the compressible, weakly bound regions of the web of the insulating material, but to the separating surface resistant to transverse tension and to pressure, namely in regions having mineral fibres oriented at right angles to the lamination. Compared thereto, the surface arranged opposite the separating surfaces are compressible in the direction of their surface normal and are accordingly able to adapt to irregularities of the surface to be insulated such as the façade of a building while the separating surfaces with the lamination, which are then positioned on the outside, remain extremely smooth. With such webs of insulating

material there can be insulated also flanges of ventilation ducts, sleeves or clamps in pipelines without having influence on the formation of the external surfaces of the thermal insulation. Thus, flanges of ventilation ducts, sleeves or clamps in pipelines can be overlapped by a corresponding web of insulating material such that the external surface does not exhibit any reliefs.'

**Examiner's Rejection Over *Noergaard* and *Klose*.** The Examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Noergaard* in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,917,750 ("*Klose*"). This ground for rejection is traversed. *Klose* does not cure the deficiencies of *Noergaard* as discussed in the paragraphs above. The combination of *Noergaard* and *Klose*, therefore, does not render claim 2 unpatentable.

**Examiner's Rejection Over *Noergaard* and *Metcalf*.** The Examiner has rejected claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Noergaard* in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,128,678 ("*Metcalf*"). This ground for rejection is traversed. Like *Klose*, *Metcalf* does not cure the deficiencies of *Noergaard*. The combination of *Noergaard* and *Metcalf* therefore does not render either claim 17 or 18 unpatentable.

**Examiner's Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2.** The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 8-12, 17-19, 22-24, 37, 38, 40-44, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The amendments to the claims render a discussion of this rejection unnecessary.

**Conclusions.** The Examiner is respectfully requested to issue a Notice of Allowance in light of the above remarks. She is further respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned should she deem it prudent to more expeditiously advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 20, 2011

/John Wilson Jones, Reg. #31380/  
John Wilson Jones  
Registration No. 31,380

JONES & SMITH LLP  
2777 Allen Parkway, Suite 1000  
Houston, Texas 77019

Telephone No.: (713) 528-3100  
Facsimile No.: (713) 893-6076